

REMARKS

Claims 18, 28 and 30 are currently amended. Claim 25 is canceled. New claims 32-35 are added. The abstract has been replaced. No new matter has been added. Consideration of the amendments above and remarks below is requested.

I: The Objection to the Abstract

The Examiner has objected to the abstract. The specification is currently amended to replace the Abstract with the Abstract above, as amended. Consideration of the amended Abstract is urged. Entry of the amended Abstract is requested.

II: The Objection to Claim 28

Claim 28 is currently amended. Reconsideration is urged.

III: The rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112 (indefinite).

The Examiner indicated that claim 20 is indefinite because the pKa in the range of 5 to 7 is outside the scope of 1 to below 7.

Applicants request reconsideration of claim 20. Claim 20 falls within the pKa scope of claim 18. Reconsideration is urged.

IV: The rejection of claims 18-21, 25-26 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in light of DE 2020227 and the rejection of claims 18-26 and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in light of Izawa.

The present disclosure relates to enzyme granules with improved stability. It has been found that the addition of a buffer salt to the core increases stability. For example, Example 1 shows increased stability of granulates in accordance with the present disclosure in comparison to granulate with no buffer salt.

In order to be obvious, the prior art reference must teach each and every element of the claimed invention. Claim 1, as amended, requires at least 25% w/w of the core to comprise acidic buffer component. Nowhere does either prior art reference alone, or in combination show that at least 25% of the core is acidic buffer component. Accordingly, claim 1 is not obvious, reconsideration is urged.

Further, nowhere does either prior art reference alone, or in combination show that at least 40% of the core is acidic buffer component, accordingly claim 26 is not obvious. Reconsideration is urged.

V: The rejection of claims 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in light of Rahman.

In order to be obvious, the prior art reference must teach each and every element of the claimed invention. Claim 1, as amended, requires at least 25% w/w of the core to be acidic buffer component. Nowhere does the prior art reference show that at least 25% of the core is acidic buffer component. Accordingly, claim 1 is not obvious. Since claims 27 and 28 depend upon claim 1, and claim 1 is not obvious, these dependent claims are not obvious. Reconsideration is urged.

VI: New Claims

New claims 32-35 are added. No new matter is added. Should any additional fees be due the USPTO is authorized to charge the deposit account of Novozymes North America, Inc, *i.e.*, Deposit Account No. 50-1701.

VII: Conclusion

The Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if there are any questions concerning this response or application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 21, 2008

/Michael W. Krenicky Reg # 45411/
Michael W. Krenicky, Reg. No. 45,411
Novozymes North America, Inc.
500 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1600
New York, NY 10110
(212) 840-0097